

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/762,834	BECKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2432	

**All Participants:**

(1) Venkat Perungavoor.

(2) Susan Yee.

**Status of Application:** after Non-Final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 July 2009

**Time:** 1:00 PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup>*

Claims discussed:

*1, 36, and 39*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Venkat Perungavoor/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated to the Applicants that the aforementioned claims does not make clear where the last four limitations takes place, i.e. "combining a system identifier...", "obtaining an encrypted string...", "parsing the encrypted string...", "decrypting one of the substrings...". That is, the claim mentions web application server and user terminal, but does not articulate which of the elements doing these functions. And further indicated a possible 112, 2nd rejection on the ground that the claims are indefinite. And further, the Examiner indicated a opening for Examiner Amendment to clear these issues.